

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me say, initially, I did not mention the issue of the source of crime guns in Illinois. The Senator from Indiana raised it. And since he did, I want to make a record of it.

When we trace the crime guns in Illinois, we find an alarming percentage of them coming from gun shows in your State right next to Illinois. The bad guys get on the Skyway, drive over to northwest Indiana gun shows and buy guns at those shows without background checks and come back and commit crime in Chicago and other neighborhoods.

That is a fact. You may not like it; I certainly don't like it. But we ought to be doing something about that instead of worrying about the gun manufacturers and the gun salesmen and whether or not they are going to get special treatment from this Agency.

But let me address the second matter that is before us, and this is Senator BRAUN's request for S. 1916, Protecting the Right to Keep and Bear Arms. I want to set the record straight at the outset. Current Federal law, the Stafford Act, prohibits the Federal Government from seizing lawfully owned guns during a period of a major disaster or emergency. It is on the books. That is the law.

The Stafford Act is also clear that during a major disaster emergency, the Federal Government is prohibited from creating new registration requirements for guns, new prohibitions on gun possession, or new prohibitions on the lawful carrying of firearms. That is on the books already. So current law already protects guns that people own legally during periods of disaster or emergency. But the Senator's bill goes much further than that.

Section 4 of the bill would amend the Stafford Act—get this—to say that the Federal Government also cannot prohibit the manufacture or sale or transfer of guns or ammunition during a disaster or emergency. There are several problems with this.

First, current law has exceptions that allow the government to continue enforcing laws already on the books during a disaster. This includes laws that prohibit convicted felons from possessing guns. Your bill does not make that exception. I am sure you don't want to do that. I hope you will look at your bill. In other words, under the bill, as I read it, during a major disaster or emergency, the government would be barred from any prohibition of gun sales, even from enforcing the current prohibition on the sale of guns to convicted felons.

That doesn't make sense. I am sure that is not what you want to do, but that is what your bill says. I hope it is not what you intended, and I am sure it is not. So please look at it carefully.

There are also legitimate reasons why the government might need to temporarily prohibit guns being sold in a disaster area. Here is something that is not outlandish. Suppose the background check system has been knocked offline in a disaster area. We wouldn't want felons taking advantage of that situation to walk into a gun dealer and buy guns that they are ineligible to buy.

Current law ensures that the government can't take anyone's lawfully owned guns away from them during a disaster, but there is no clear justification for granting untouchable status to gun sales during the disaster. This bill needs some work. I hope we will not pass it in a hasty manner. And in light of these and other concerns, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

#### NOMINATION OF DAVID CHIPMAN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, David Chipman is the nominee for the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Agency. I know a bit about him because he went through the Agency process. He is a veteran of over 20 years working for this Agency. We need him. I will tell you why we need him.

In the history of the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Agency, there has only been one person who has served—I believe it is from your State of Minnesota. There is only one person who served as the confirmed Director of the Agency. Otherwise, over and over again, it goes without any leadership. You say: Well, is that just an accident that this Agency never has a Director? I don't think it is an accident at all.

You see, the gun lobby, when they want to make their case against new gun laws, always say the same thing: "Well, just enforce the laws on the books. You don't need new laws. Enforce the laws on the books."

If you bought that premise, then the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Agency is one of the agencies that does that. So if you can weaken this Agency—fewer agents, fewer employees, fewer supervisors, no Director—then the actual enforcement that is being done by this Agency is diminished.

So, now, President Biden brings us Mr. Chipman. There are two parts of his career that should be noted: Over 20 years at ATF, involved in some of the most serious investigations, and did an incredible job. After he left the ATF, he went to work for a gun safety group. He is the first one to tell you: "I own a gun, and I respect your Second Amendment rights and my Second Amendment rights, but I don't want guns to get into the hands of the wrong people, and that is how I would run the ATF."

I think that reflects what the majority of Americans think. Second Amendment rights—I honor them, I respect them, they are in the law, decided by the Supreme Court in the Heller deci-

sion, but when it comes to guns—and I look at the wanton violence taking place. I don't want guns getting into the hands of convicted felons. No, I don't. I don't think they have any Second Amendment right, neither does David Chipman. But the people behind the gun lobby, gun industry don't want an Agency that actually enforces those laws. They really don't. And so they are trying to stop his nomination.

It may be controversial, but I hope he gets this job. I am going to vote for him.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this morning, our friends in Europe claimed first place in the race against climate change. The European Union has laid out a plan to decarbonize Europe and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 55 percent at the end of this decade. It is an ambitious plan, and it is one that will, in the words of EU climate policy chief Frans Timmermans, "give humanity a fighting chance."

To our allies in Europe, I want to say: America stands with you in this effort, and we welcome the friendly competition to see who can move quickest to save our planet.

Earlier today, President Biden joined members of the Senate Democratic caucus to discuss our historic budget proposal that was unveiled last night. It is a proposal designed, first and foremost, to help working families and secondly—and not a distant second, right up with that—to secure our planet's future.

Climate change impacts every single one of us. It doesn't care about our borders or national identities. It does present an opportunity for us to lead the world in saving this planet, literally, for our kids and grandkids.

I am glad we have a President who understands this issue. The budget resolution we discussed with him today will pave the way for that to happen.

#### VOTING RIGHTS

Madam President, more than 156,000 Allied troops stormed the beaches of Normandy on D-day. Among them were 2,000 African-American soldiers. Within that group was an even smaller band of brothers: 700 members of the 320th Barrage Balloon Battalion, the only—all Black combat unit to take part in D-day.

Ten days ago, on the Fourth of July, Henry Parham—the last known living member of that historic African-American battalion—died at a veteran's hospital in Pittsburgh. He was 99 years old.

He was one in a million, literally. He was one of the 1 million African-American men and women who served in the

branches of the military that were still segregated for U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. Many of these Black patriots believed they were fighting for a double victory, to beat fascism and to beat segregation and racism at home.

Another African-American soldier who took part in the Normandy invasion left high school at 17 to enlist in the Army. He served 2 years in France and Germany.

When he returned to Mississippi, Jim Crow was waiting for him with “Whites only” water fountains, segregated public schools, discriminatory poll taxes, and literacy tests when you showed up to vote. So this veteran of the U.S. Army, this Black veteran of the U.S. Army who risked his life to fight for democracy, had to return to America and fight for it again.

In 1954, he became the first Mississippi field secretary for the NAACP. One of his first assignments was the 1955 killing of Emmett Till. He was asked to look into that for the NAACP. He organized boycotts of segregated businesses, and voter registration drives were established to help African Americans. For his efforts, he received countless death threats. His home was fire-bombed, and they tried to kill him more than once.

On June 12, 1963, he arrived home after a midnight meeting, got out of his car, took a few steps, and was shot in the back by a White supremacist Klansman. The bullet pierced his heart and killed him. He was 37 years old.

I remember the news reports on this. I was just a kid in college. The victim's name was Medgar Evers. When he was murdered, he was carrying in his arms NAACP T-shirts that read “Jim Crow Must Go.”

Sixty years later, I am afraid Jim Crow is still around. The invidious voting discrimination that Medgar Evers, John Lewis, Fannie Lou Hamer, and so many others sacrificed so much to end has not just returned in Mississippi, is not just returning to the South but across America. We are witnessing a coordinated, relentless, nationwide attack on voting rights and on free and fair elections in America.

Already this year, 17 States have enacted 28 new laws to make it harder for Americans—especially people of color—to vote. A total of nearly 400 bills eliminating the right to vote have been introduced in 48 States. These new voter suppression laws and proposed laws are the poisonous fruit of a dangerous, discredited lie, the Big Lie, the same one that brought a murderous mob from a Trump rally to this Capitol on January 6.

An angry, insecure man with a fragile ego can't bear the thought of losing. He can't stand the notion of public rejection, so he summoned the mob to the Capitol on January 6 to try to overturn the Presidential election. They were on a mission for the President. As a result of their storming this Capitol, more than 140 Capitol Hill and other police officers were injured. One died defending this Capitol, defending us.

The fact is, the 2020 election was free and fair, and Donald Trump lost. Despite all of his protests and lawsuits, there is no evidence other than that.

A record number of Americans in that election braved a deadly pandemic to cast their votes. The Department of Homeland Security called the election “the most secure in American history.” More than 80 judges, including many conservatives appointed by President Trump himself, threw out his claims in court that the election was stolen.

When a voting machine company sued one of those lawyers for defamation over false claims of switched and stolen votes, the defense her lawyer offered was that “no reasonable person” would believe his client's voter fraud lies. Yet Republican lawmakers in nearly every State are now using those same lies and the Big Lie to wage a sweeping assault on voting rights.

These new voter suppression laws would make it harder for millions of Americans to cast their votes. Many who are eligible to cast their votes would lose the opportunity because of these new laws. Even more alarming, in many States, new laws would make it easier for partisan election officials to simply throw out election results they don't like.

Donald Trump used all the powers of his Presidency to try to force State election officials to overrule the will of their State's voters and he failed. The rule of law won. Remember the recording he had with the election official in Georgia? He did everything but threaten him with criminal action if he didn't change the final official vote tally. Now some Republicans State legislators want to change the laws to make voter nullification schemes legal. Never before in American history have we allowed anything like that.

This is not democracy, and it must not be allowed to happen. This week, 51 lawmakers from the State of Texas took the extraordinary step of leaving their State to deny the Texas House a quorum and prevent it from passing yet another State voter suppression law. The Texas law, among other things, would end the very practices that made it possible for historic numbers of Americans to vote safely and securely last November, things like drive-through voting, 24-hour polling places, ballot drop boxes. Each one of these changes would make it harder for poor people and minorities to vote, and that is what this is all about.

In fleeing their State and traveling to Washington, the Texas lawmakers are sending an SOS for American democracy. They are sending a distress signal for voting rights. They are pleading with the Senate, our Senate, to act, to end the Republican filibuster of the For the People Act and update and pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Act now. Only Federal action and Federal protections can stop this assault on America's voting rights.

Madam President, there are solutions. This onslaught of attacks on

voting rights and election independence would not be possible without two rulings from the conservative majority of the Supreme Court that have gutted the Voting Rights Act.

Earlier today, the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution held a hearing on what it takes to restore the Voting Rights Act after the misguided Shelby County decision and Brnovich decision this month. I want to thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for chairing that important hearing.

I want to commend President Biden for speaking out so forcefully about protecting voting rights in his speech yesterday in Philadelphia. Like President Kennedy nearly 60 years ago, President Biden reminded us that voting rights are not just a political issue; they are a moral issue. It is not just merely a legal concern; it is a concern that goes to our values as Americans. I also strongly support Attorney General Garland's decision to double the size of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division after years of attrition.

But the only way to truly end this unprecedented assault on voting is for Congress to step up. It is our responsibility. The Big Lie that brought a deadly insurrection into this Chamber on January 6 has American democracy in its crosshairs. We have to act, and now is the time.

The Senate must end the Republican filibuster of the For the People Act, stop voter suppression in States, get dark money out of politics, prevent billionaires from buying elections, and end partisan gerrymandering. We cannot stand on ceremony and tradition while the pillars of our democracy are destroyed. If we lose free and fair elections, we lose our democracy. We must also introduce and pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act to restore and expand those rights and prevent voter suppression. I am working with Senator LEAHY to that end.

The right to vote is an American ideal. It shouldn't be a partisan battle. John Lewis told us so often—“The vote is precious,” he said. “It is almost sacred. It is the most powerful non-violent tool we have in a democratic society. And we have to use it.”

I will close with this story. Every year, John Lewis led a group of Congress Members and others on what he called a pilgrimage to some of the sacred places of the American civil rights movement. I had the privilege of attending one of those pilgrimages.

In 2014, John Lewis led the pilgrimage to a different hallowed ground in American history. That year, the 50th anniversary of the Freedom Summer, John Lewis led groups to Money, MS, to the place where Emmett Till was murdered. Remember Emmett Till, the teenager from Chicago who was brutally murdered in the South in Mississippi? They went to Philadelphia, MS, as well, where three young civil rights activists—names well known to my generation—James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner,

were kidnapped and murdered during Freedom Summer because they were there to register Black voters. Then they traveled to Jackson, MS, to the house where Medgar Evers was cut down by an assassin's bullet.

Standing on the spot where Medgar Evers fell, John's voice caught as he said:

The night this man was shot and killed, something died in all of us in the [civil rights] movement.

John Lewis led his pilgrimage to Mississippi that year because he wanted us to never forget the terrible sacrifices of so many to fulfill the promise of our Nation and secure voting rights.

This Saturday will mark the 1-year anniversary of John Lewis's passing. I miss him. He was a real friend. When he left us, something in all of us wept. We can keep the spirit of John Lewis alive by defending the greatest cause of his life, the cause for which he nearly died as a young man on that bridge in Selma: the right of every American to vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I complete my remarks before the vote is called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, this is my fourth speech this year arguing how we are going to have to match our defense resources to our national defense strategy. And this is a reminder—this is the National Defense Strategy. People seem to be forgetting about this. It was put together in 2018. Here are the names of the individuals. One was a former colleague; it was Jon Kyl. So we had 12, 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats. Everyone agreed that this is what we need to do, not just for 2018 but for each year afterwards. For this year, for example, they actually have in here that we should be increasing the defense budget by between 3 and 5 percent. I show this because we all adhered to these, Democrats and Republicans, up until this year.

This is the first time I have had a chance to talk about this budget in the Biden administration where we now have a lot of the details actually released in terms of the budget and what it does to our military.

Remember, our expert, bipartisan NDS Commission Report said that we need 3 to 5 percent real growth in the defense budget each year to actually execute this strategy. The defense budget the Biden administration sent us does not achieve this goal. In fact, it is really a cut, in this administration.

Even worse, just last week, the Fed predicted that inflation next year will be bigger than predicted. If that continues, this budget will mean even bigger cuts than expected and will hamstring our troops even more than we thought.

A lower defense top line than last year is just the first problem. The de-

tails of this budget are also worse than we forecasted. We have a flow chart here that shows that the budget puts shipbuilding on a starvation diet. The Navy tells us that we need 355 ships, probably more than the 400 that we have—that we are talking about right now. Right now, we are under 300 ships, and the trend is down, not up. What is the administration's answer? They joke around about having a 355-ship Navy with only tugboats, but we don't have the luxury of jokes.

The people don't know this out there. The people don't realize that China is ahead of us and that Russia is ahead of us in some of these areas. They assume that we are always like it was right after World War II for so many years.

The Chinese Navy already has 355 ships. They already have them. That is not something they are looking for like we are right now. We are at 300 ships and looking for 355. They already have them. Then there are the Russians to add to that. That is another 223. So we are talking about far more that they have right now than we have, and nobody understands that. It is as if we have only one opposition out there, one adversary. We don't. We have several. The two prime adversaries are China and Russia, and they are up right now to 595 ships, and we are at 300. So what does that tell you?

I am not the only one who is concerned about this. A lot of people say: Well, the Republicans are the only ones who are concerned about our military.

And that is not true. Democratic Congresswoman ELAINE LURIA said it well. She said: The Navy budget is not a serious budget for great power competition.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD her recent article about the Navy's fleet.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Texas National Security Review, June 14, 2021]

#### WAR ON THE ROCKS—LOOK TO THE 1980S TO INFORM THE FLEET OF TODAY (By Rep. Elaine Luria)

When I was a naval officer, my ships always had a plan when we left port for where we were going, how we would get there, and what we would do when we arrived. While that remains true of individual ships in the Navy, it's not true of the Navy as a whole today. The Navy lacks a comprehensive maritime strategy that defines what the Navy needs to do, how it needs to do it, the resources required, and how to manage risk if those resources aren't available. The Navy had a strategy that did these things in the past. The maritime strategy of the 1980s articulated a clear vision for the Navy's purpose and how Navy leaders planned to achieve it. The nation would be well-served by the Navy's developing such a strategy again.

I entered the U.S. Naval Academy in 1993 and was part of a new generation of officers who assumed the watch after the fall of the Soviet Union. We were the beneficiaries of a nation that had a clear and defensible maritime strategy, an administration that pro-

vided the vision, a Congress that funded it, and a Navy that executed it. Throughout my career, I deployed on both the Navy's oldest and newest ships, but they were all designed for the Cold War against the Soviet Union.

With China, the world has seen the meteoric rise of a maritime power that threatens U.S. and allied interests as well as free access to the maritime common. The United States and like-minded nations are engaged in a new great-power competition. As the Navy focuses almost exclusively on future capabilities, it risks overlooking the immediate threats posed by that competition today. A Battle Force 2045 plan does little to ensure a ready battle force in 2025. Today, no longer in uniform, but as the vice chair of the House Armed Services Committee, I believe the constitutional role of Congress "to provide and maintain a navy" should be based on something more than future hopes in technology and budget expectations. We need to be prepared now for any contingencies that may occur on our collective watch.

#### UNDERSTANDING THE 1980S MARITIME STRATEGY DURING GREAT-POWER COMPETITION

In August 1982, Vice Chief of Naval Operations Adm. William Small ordered the development of a document "to connect national strategy with defense programming." Developed in just three weeks using briefing slides and speaking notes, this document birthed the Navy's first global maritime strategy, which was designed to inform the Navy budgeting process.

The authors developed the briefing using then-current war plans, contemporary directives on national defense policy, and intelligence estimates of the Soviet threat, brought together with Secretary of the Navy John Lehman's concept of a 600-ship navy. Over 18 months, the briefing evolved until it was finally signed by the chief of naval operations and issued as the Navy's 1984 Maritime Strategy. As Lehman noted, "Once we had established the maritime strategy, we set about relating and conforming everything else we did in the Navy and Marine Corps to it." Because of the global reach and strength of the strategy, the Navy's stated need for a 600-ship fleet was defensible, and clearly tied to the numbers and types of ships needed to win in conflict. With the full support of the president, this strategy launched the nation on a trajectory to a massive Navy build-up, which nearly realized this fleet before the conclusion of the Cold War. The strategy clearly showed why the Navy needed 600 ships and indicated exactly where they would be deployed in global wartime operations. Additionally—and often overlooked when discussing the strategy—the strategy articulated the requirement for a peacetime presence to fill deterrent roles, reduce response times, and provide policymakers with naval crisis-response options. One-third of the ships needed for wartime missions in each theater would always be forward deployed under the strategy. Ensuring force-structure assessments have lacked this clear strategic vision for the role of naval forces.

#### BACK TO THE FUTURE

Lehman recently noted, "In some previous and current periods, naval strategy (if you could call it that) has been derived from predicted budgets. During the 1980s, the process was reversed: first strategy, then requirements, then the [Program Objective Memorandum], then budget." The difference between strategy preceding budget or budget preceding strategy is the difference between going to the store with a shopping list to make a specific meal, and going to the store, looking in your wallet, and asking, "What could I buy with that?" According to Lehman, a good strategy is a living document